UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,938	03/19/2004	Akio Urabe	250483US2	6734

22850 7590 07/21/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,938	URABE, AKIO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S. PARK	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-12 and 14-20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3 and 13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 4/28/08, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-20** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Upon review of the references of Iida (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,023) and Simpson (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/016559), the examiner notes that the references can still be interpreted to maintain the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as currently amended.

Particularly, as amended, claim 1 now requires "***a generating unit configured to generate report data when the determining unit determines that the aspect of the image processing apparatus is in the predetermined situation***, the report data including the predetermined situation of the image processing apparatus". Referring to col. 5, lines 4-14 of Iida, the references discloses a status information generating section for generating the status HTML file (which is construed as the claimed limitation of "report data") when the apparatus is in idling, operating, and error states (which is construed as the claimed limitation of "an aspect of the image processing apparatus in a predetermined situation").

Claim 1 further requires "a transmitting unit configured to ***transmit the report data to the managing apparatus via the firewall*** using the at least one of the predetermined protocols having an immediacy". Iida discloses a transmitting unit for

transmitting the status HTML file to the client machine (col. 5, lines, lines 54-67). Iida, however, does not explicitly disclose that the report data is transmitted to the managing apparatus via the firewall. Simpson, the same field of endeavor the HTTP network communication between a client computer (704) and a network printing device (printer 710 in fig. 9), discloses the HTTP network communication, wherein a client computer (704) can communicate with the network printing device 710 via a firewall (paragraph 73). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the network of Iida to include the firewall between the network facsimile 201 and client machine 202 for allowing the data transmission using HTTP as taught by Simpson. The suggestion/motivation for modifying the network of Iida would have been to filter out unwanted communication packets in conventional manner (paragraph 72 of Simpson).

Claim 1 further requires "a firewall configured to control data transmission between the first computer network and the second computer network, ***the firewall configured to allow reply data sent by the managing apparatus in the second computer network to reach the image processing apparatus in the first computer network***". Referring to paragraph 46 of Simpson, the reference describes that the communication network having the firewall represents a plurality of networks including Internet and LAN (paragraph 122). Since Iida discloses a step of the managing apparatus sending reply data (sending user specified update time upon receiving the HTML status file in ST403~ST406 of fig. 5 & col. 8, lines 38-43), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the network of Iida to include the

firewall between the network facsimile 201 and client machine 202 for allowing the data transmission using HTTP as taught by Simpson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It recites the step of generating acknowledgement data and transmitting the reply data to the image processing apparatus. It is unclear if the acknowledgement data is included in the reply data for transmission. Is the data simply generated and stored in the memory? Clarification/explanation from the Specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 10 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iida U.S. Patent No. 6,785,023 in view of Simpson et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/016559 (hereinafter Simpson).

With respect to claim 1, Iida discloses an image processing apparatus management system (network system in fig. 3 & col. 4, lines 11-18) comprising:

an image processing apparatus (network facsimile 201) connected to a first computer network and having a printing function, the image processing apparatus including a determining unit configured to determine whether an aspect of the image processing apparatus is in a predetermined situation (a status information generating section for generating the status HTML file when the apparatus is in idling, operating, and error states in col. 5, lines 4-14);

a managing apparatus connected to a second computer network and configured to manage the image processing apparatus (client machine 202);

a network link (fig. 1) configured to control data transmission between the first computer network and the second computer network, the network link configured to allow reply data sent by the managing apparatus in the second computer network to reach the image processing apparatus in the first computer network (sending user specified update time upon receiving the HTML status file in ST403~ST406 of fig. 5 & col. 8, lines 38-43), the reply data being in reply to an access to the managing apparatus from the image processing apparatus using at least one of a predetermined protocol having an immediacy (note that the HTTP of Iida is interpreted as the predetermined protocols having an immediacy since HTTP protocol allows immediate access to the web in the WWW browser operation);

a generating unit configured to generate report data when the determining unit determines that the aspect of the image processing apparatus is in the predetermined

situation, the report data including the predetermined situation of the image processing apparatus (a status information generating section for generating the status HTML file when the apparatus is in idling, operating, and error states in col. 5, lines 4-14); and

a transmitting unit configured to transmit the report data to the managing apparatus via the network link using the at least one of the predetermined protocols having an immediacy (col. 5, lines, lines 54-67).

Iida, however, does not explicitly disclose that the image processing apparatus is connected to the computer network via a firewall that allows data transmitted using predetermined protocols to pass through.

Simpson, the same field of endeavor the HTTP network communication between a client computer (704) and a network printing device (printer 710 in fig. 9), discloses the HTTP network communication, wherein a client computer (704) can communicate with the network printing device 710 via a firewall (paragraph 73).

Moreover, referring to paragraph 46 of Simpson, the reference describes that the communication link having the firewall represents a plurality of networks including Internet and LAN (paragraph 122).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the network of Iida to include the firewall between the network facsimile 201 and client machine 202 for allowing the data transmission using HTTP as taught by Simpson.

The suggestion/motivation for modifying the network of Iida would have been to filter out unwanted communication packets in conventional manner (paragraph 72 of Simpson).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida with Simpson to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus management system, wherein the network allows reply data (user specified desired update time in col. 8, lines 38-43) sent by the managing apparatus in response to the report data, to pass through and reach the image processing apparatus (HTTP protocols for exchanging the HTML file in col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26).

Again, as noted above in claim 1, Iida does not explicitly disclose that the image processing apparatus is connected to the computer network via a firewall that allows data transmitted using predetermined protocols to pass through.

Simpson, the same field of endeavor the HTTP network communication between a client computer (704) and a network printing device (printer 710 in fig. 9), discloses the HTTP network communication, wherein the client computer (704) can communicate with the network printing device 710 via a firewall (paragraph 73).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the network of Iida to include the firewall between the network facsimile 201 and client machine 202 for allowing the data transmission using HTTP as taught by Simpson.

The suggestion/motivation for modifying the network of Iida would have been to filter out unwanted communication packets in conventional manner (paragraph 72 of Simpson).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida with Simpson to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

With respect to claim 4, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus management system according to claim 1, wherein the protocol having the immediacy is hypertext transfer protocol (Again, the HTTP of Iida (col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26) is interpreted as the predetermined protocols having an immediacy since HTTP protocol allows immediate access to the web in the WWW browser operation).

With respect to claim 7, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

With respect to claim 10, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus, further comprising:

an abnormal condition detecting unit that detects an occurrence or a possibility of occurrence of an abnormal condition in the image processing apparatus (detecting error such as jam and lack of toner at the printer in col. 5, lines 8-12), wherein

if the occurrence or the possibility of occurrence of the abnormal condition is detected, the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including therein, information about the abnormal condition (generating the HTML status file incorporating the detected error information in col. 5, lines 12-14).

With respect to claim 15, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus, wherein the protocol having the immediacy is hypertext transfer protocol (Again, the HTTP of Iida (col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26) is interpreted as the predetermined protocols having an immediacy since HTTP protocol allows immediate access to the web in the WWW browser operation).

With respect to claim 16, Iida teaches a method in which a managing apparatus manages an image processing apparatus (network facsimile 201), the managing apparatus (client machine 202) and the image processing apparatus being connected to a second computer network and a first computer network, respectively, and the image processing apparatus communicating with the managing apparatus via a network link that allows data transmitted using predetermined protocols to pass through, wherein at least one of the predetermined protocols has an immediacy (the HTTP of Iida (col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26) is interpreted as the predetermined protocols having an immediacy since HTTP protocol allows immediate access to the web in the WWW browser operation), comprising:

determining whether an aspect of the image processing apparatus is in a predetermined situation (a status information generating section for generating the status HTML file when the apparatus is in idling, operating, and error states in col. 5, lines 4-14);

transmitting report data indicating when the aspect of the image processing apparatus is in a predetermined situation from the image processing apparatus to the

managing apparatus via the network link using the at least one of the predetermined protocol having an immediacy (col. 5, lines, lines 54-67);

receiving report data from the image processing apparatus sent through the first and second computer networks and the network link using the at least one of the predetermined protocols having the immediacy at the managing apparatus outputting contents of the report data received by the managing apparatus (a status information generating section for generating the status HTML file when the apparatus is in idling, operating, and error states in col. 5, lines 4-14);

generating and sending reply data (user specified desired update time in col. 8, lines 38-43) from the managing apparatus to the image processing apparatus via the network link, in response to the report data received by the image processing apparatus (HTTP protocols for exchanging the HTML file in col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26); and

allowing the reply data sent through the network link to reach the image processing apparatus (fig. 5).

Simpson, the same field of endeavor the HTTP network communication between a client computer (704) and a network printing device (printer 710 in fig. 9), discloses the HTTP network communication, wherein a client computer (704) can communicate with the network printing device 710 via a firewall (paragraph 73).

Moreover, referring to paragraph 46 of Simpson, the reference describes that the communication link having the firewall represents a plurality of networks including Internet and LAN (paragraph 122).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the network of Iida to include the firewall between the network facsimile 201 and client machine 202 for allowing the data transmission using HTTP as taught by Simpson.

The suggestion/motivation for modifying the network of Iida would have been to filter out unwanted communication packets in conventional manner (paragraph 72 of Simpson).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Iida with Simpson to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

With respect to claim 17, Iida teaches the method according to claim 16, wherein the protocol having the immediacy is hypertext transfer protocol (Again, the HTTP of Iida (col. 3, lines 56-59 & col. 4, lines 23-26) is interpreted as the predetermined protocols having an immediacy since HTTP protocol allows immediate access to the web in the WWW browser operation).

With respect to claim 18, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the managing apparatus, when receiving the report data from the image processing apparatus, generates acknowledgement data indicating reception of the report data (upon receiving the HTML status file, it generates the homepage data for display in S405 in fig. 5), and transmits the reply data to the image processing apparatus through the firewall (user specified desired update time in col. 8, lines 38-43).

With respect to claims 19 and 20, referring to paragraph 46 of Simpson, the reference describes that the communication link having the firewall represents a plurality of networks including Internet and LAN (paragraph 122).

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iida with Simpson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hopper et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,061,391 (hereinafter Hopper).

With respect to claim 5, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus management system according to claim 1, wherein the managing apparatus includes an informing unit (display for displaying the homepage in fig. 7) that informs an operator of contents of the report data (client machine displaying the homepage informing the user of the status of network facsimile according to col. 5, lines 4-14 & col. 6, lines 3-28).

The combination, however, does not explicitly disclose that the informing unit informs the operator of an identification of the image processing apparatus that sent the status report data.

Hopper, the same field of endeavor of informing the status report of the printing apparatus (displaying the printer status in fig. 2), discloses a client computer including an informing unit (monitor 34 in fig. 1) for informing the user of an identification of the image processing apparatus (displaying the name of each printer in col. 3, lines 33-36 wherein the printer name represents the identification of the printer according to col. 11,

lines 17-19) that sent the status report data and the content of the report data (displaying the printer toner status in fig. 2).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the informing unit of Iida to display the identification of the image processing apparatus that sent the status report data as taught by Hopper.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to describe where in the printers are located by referring to the names (col. 3, lines 33-36 of Hopper).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

With respect to claim 6, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus management system according to claim 1, wherein the managing apparatus includes a report outputting unit (display for displaying the homepage in fig. 7) that outputs contents of the report data (client machine displaying the homepage informing the user of the status of network facsimile according to col. 5, lines 4-14 & col. 6, lines 3-28).

The combination, however, does not explicitly disclose that the report outputting unit outputs the operator of an identification of the image processing apparatus that sent the status report data.

Hopper, the same field of endeavor of outputting the status report of the printing apparatus (displaying the printer status in fig. 2), discloses a client computer including a report outputting unit (monitor 34 in fig. 1) for outputting the user of an identification of the image processing apparatus (displaying the name of each printer in col. 3, lines 33-

36 wherein the printer name represents the identification of the printer according to col. 11, lines 17-19) that sent the status report data and the content of the report data (displaying the printer toner status in fig. 2).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the report outputting unit of Iida to display the identification of the image processing apparatus that sent the status report data as taught by Hopper.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to describe where in the printers are located by referring to the names (col. 3, lines 33-36 of Hopper).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

6. Claims 8, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iida and Simpson as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Haines et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,043,523 (hereinafter Haines).

With respect to claim 8, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 7, but the combination dose not explicitly disclose:

a remaining amount detecting unit that detects an amount of unused consumable product in the image processing apparatus, wherein

if the amount detected is equal to or less than a predetermined value, the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including therein, information about the consumable product.

Haines, the same field of endeavor of the printing device generating a status report and transmitting the report to the user (the printer 14 sending status notification to the user in col. 4, lines 45-50), discloses a printing device (printer 14 in fig. 1) comprising:

a remaining amount detecting unit that detects an amount of unused consumable product in the image processing apparatus (detecting either "toner low" or "toner out" according to col. 7, lines 29-36), wherein

if the amount detected is equal to or less than a predetermined value (a predetermined value that distinguishes the toner statuses between "toner low" or "toner out" according to col. 7, lines 29-36. Note that this predetermined value must be in the system in order to distinguish the different toner statues), a report generating/transmitting unit generates a status report data by including therein (generating the toner status report and emailing the report to a user in col. 7, lines 29-36), information about the consumable product (sending either "toner low" or "toner out" notification in col. 7, lines 29-36).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the image processing apparatus of Iida to include the remaining amount detecting unit and modify the report generating/transmitting unit to generate information about the consumable product based on the detected result as taught by Haines.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify the user with more accurate information about the consumable product, such as "toner low" or "toner out" statuses (col. 7, lines 29-36 of Haines).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

With respect to claim 9, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 7, but the combination dose not explicitly disclose:

a product replacement detecting unit that detects whether a product in the image processing apparatus must be replaced, wherein

if the product replacement detecting unit detects that the product must be replaced, the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including therein, information about the product to be replaced.

Haines, the same field of endeavor of the printing device generating a status report and transmitting the report to the user (the printer 14 sending status notification to the user in col. 4, lines 45-50), discloses a printing device (printer 14 in fig. 1) comprising:

a product replacement detecting unit that detects whether a product in the image processing apparatus must be replaced (detecting the “toner out” condition in col. 7, lines 34-36), wherein

if the product replacement detecting unit detects that the product must be replaced (the "toner out" notification apparently indicates that the toner must be

replaced), a report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including therein, information about the product to be replaced (notifying the "toner out" condition in the email which indicates a new toner is needed according to col. 7, lines 34-36).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the image processing apparatus of Iida to include the product replacement detecting unit and modify the report generating/transmitting unit to generate information about the product to be replaced based on the detected result as taught by Haines.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify the user with when to replace the toner (col. 8, lines 15-20 of Haines).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

With respect to claim 14, Iida discloses the image processing apparatus, further comprising:

a utilization state acquiring unit that acquires state (acquiring/determining whether the printer is in idling/operating/error state in col. 6, lines 7-20) information about a utilization state of the image processing apparatus (col. 6, lines 7-20), wherein

the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including the state information therein, and transmits the report data to the managing apparatus (sending the status HTML file in col. 5, lines 54-67).

Iida, however, does not explicitly disclose that the report generating/transmitting unit transmits the report data to the managing apparatus at a predetermined interval.

Haines, the same field of endeavor of the printing device generating a status report and transmitting the report to the user (the printer 14 sending status notification to the user in col. 4, lines 45-50), discloses a printing device (printer 14 in fig. 1) for sending the status notification at a predetermined interval (sending the email status notification at a regular interval according to col. 7, lines 3-14).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the report transmitting unit of Iida to transmit the report data at a predetermined interval as taught by Haines.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with the status report at a regular basis (col. 7, lines 3-14 of Haines).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

7. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iida and Simpson as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Zerza et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,149,697 (hereinafter Zerza).

With respect to claim 11, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 7, but it does not explicitly disclose an inputting unit that inputs an instruction, wherein if the instruction is input, the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including the instruction therein.

Zerza, the same field of endeavor the printer sending the report data to the user's PC (sending the consumable order information to the user's PC in col. 3, lines 58-63), discloses an image processing apparatus (printer in fig. 2) comprising an inputting unit that inputs an instruction (user of the printer entering desired pricing for particular consumables in col. 3, lines 43-48 & col. 4, lines 9-12), wherein if the instruction is input, a report generating/transmitting unit generates a report data by including the instruction therein (sending the consumable order information including the user input information to the user's PC in col. 3, lines 58-63).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the image processing apparatus of Iida to include an input unit and to modify the report generating/transmitting unit of Iida to generate the report data having the instruction therein as taught by Zerza.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method of ordering a particular consumable at the image processing apparatus and to notify the user's PC of the order that has been placed (col. 3, lines 42-63 of Zerza).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

With respect to claim 12, the combination of Iida and Simpson discloses the image processing apparatus according to claim 7, but it does not explicitly disclose an order information inputting unit that inputs order information to order a consumable product, wherein if the order information is input, the report generating/transmitting unit generates the report data by including the order information therein.

Zerza, the same field of endeavor the printer sending the report data to the user's PC (sending the consumable order information to the user's PC in col. 3, lines 58-63), discloses an image processing apparatus (printer in fig. 2) comprising an order information inputting unit that inputs order information to order a consumable product (user of the printer entering desired pricing for particular consumables in col. 3, lines 43-48 & col. 4, lines 9-12), wherein if the order information is input, a report generating/transmitting unit generates a report data by including the order information therein (sending the consumable order information including the user input information to the user's PC in col. 3, lines 58-63).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the image processing apparatus of Iida to include an order input unit and to modify the report generating/transmitting unit of Iida to generate the report data having the order information therein as taught by Zerza.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method of ordering a particular consumable at the image processing apparatus and to notify the user's PC of the order that has been placed (col. 3, lines 42-63 of Zerza).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 3 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHAN S PARK/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

July 9, 2008

/Edward L. Coles/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625